

REMARKS

Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application.

Claims 8-11, 13-15, 17, and 23-37 were allowed.

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ajanovic U.S. Patent No. 6,298,426 (hereinafter "Ajanovic").

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mehta et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,681,301 (hereinafter "Mehta").

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta in view of Gillingham et al. U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0047450 (hereinafter "Gillingham").

Summary Of Applicant's Reply

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 8-11, 13-15, 17, and 23-37 have been allowed.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 27, and 29-30 to more clearly define the invention. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The § 112 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant has amended claims 29 and 30 to more particularly define the invention. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Rejections of Claims 1-7

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ajanovic. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Mehta. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta in view of Gillingham. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ajanovic refers to an output driver that provides either a chip select function or a memory address function, depending on the signal it receives from a multiplexor. See, for example, multiplexor 402B (in FIG. 4B), which receives chip select RAS7-6/CS7-6 at one input and a memory address MA3-2 at its other input. During operation, the multiplexor outputs either the chip select or the memory address to the output driver depending on the select signal it receives on CFGAB.

Ajanovic fails to show or suggest "configuring at least one pin having a selectable functionality to have a functionality in accordance with a type of memory, wherein the functionality selectable for configuring include a chip select function and a clock function," as defined in independent


claim 1. Moreover, nowhere in Ajanovic does it show or suggest a multiplexor or an output driver for configuring the functionality of a pin to be a chip select function or a clock function. Rather, Ajanovic is limited to selecting among a chip select function and a memory address function. A memory address function is not a clock function. Indeed, Ajanovic does show a clock, but this clock is not a selectable option that can be provided by a multiplexor or an output driver to configure a pin having a selectable functionality.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. In addition, dependent claims 2-7 are also allowable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons they depend from independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-7 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1-11, 13-15, 17, and 23-37 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Van Court", written over a horizontal line.

Andrew Van Court
Registration No. 48,506
Agent for Applicant
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1104
Tel.: (212) 596-9000